UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,966	03/30/2001	Lev Brouk	ODVFP009	3909

22434 7590 08/27/2007

BEYER WEAVER LLP
P.O. BOX 70250
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER	
TRUONG, LAN DAI T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2152	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
08/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/820,966	BROUK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lan-Dai Thi Truong	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *03* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 June 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-10 and 17-79* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-10 and 17-79* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/06/2007 has been entered.

2. This action is response to communications: application, filed on 03/30/2001; amendment filed 06/06/2007. Claims 1, 3-10, 17-79; claims 1, 32, 51, 52, 63-64 are amended.

3. The applicant's arguments file on 06/06/2007 have fully considered but the new scope of amended claims 1, 32, 51, 52, 63-64 are moot in view with new ground for rejections, see the following rejections for details

Claim rejections-35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-10,17-23, 25-56, 60-70, 74-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Stewart et al. (US 2002/0019797) in view of Ghoneimy et al. (US 2004/0078373) in view of Davis et al. (U.S. 6,260,062)

Regarding claim 1:

Stewart discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method, which can be implemented in a computer hardware or software code for routing messages from one or more sending services to one or more recipient service across a message interchange network, comprising:

Receiving a message from a sending service, said message including a header element and at least one of a body element including one or more documents that a sending service is sending to a recipient service and an attachment including one or more documents that a sending service is sending to a recipient service: (Stewar discloses a message routing system includes a collaboration hub hosting has capable of receiving and sending messages between "trading partners" those share functionality with "sending service and receiving service" as claimed; the message routing system allows the trading partners to create, exchange messages to each others; the sending message includes the routing criteria in the header portion of the sending message: [0030]; [0081]; [0253]; [0023]; [0025]; [0027]-[0028]; [0105])

Determining a route path for delivery for said message to said one or more recipient services, wherein said determining being based on one or more of a routing script defined by a sending service; a routing script defined by a recipient service, and a routing script defined by an in-transit service, such as that each service is capable of independently effecting said determining of said route path: (in light of the specification, page 5, paragraph [1019]; [0139]; [1040]; [1041],

the term "in-transit service," means performing variety of functions such as data transformation, enrichment, cross-reference ID mapping, filtering, credit scoring or the like. Also, in light of the specification ([0066]; [0069]), the term "routing script" means routing instruction included in the message header; in analogous art, in Stewar's collaboration system, each trading partner can create and set filter rules for transmitting messages within trading environment; the sending message also includes "the routing criteria in the header portion of the message" which shares functionality with "routing script" as claimed which enables routing the message to target recipients: figure 5; figure 6; figure 7; [0127]-[0130]; [0170]; [0253]-[0054]; [0056]; [0081]; [0084])

Route path including one or more in-transit services; delivering said message to an in-transit service in said route path, wherein said in-transit service performs an identifiable operation on said message as said message travels from a sending service to a recipient service: ((Stewar discloses "Publish-side filters / Receiver-side filters" those shares functionality with "in-transit services" as claimed are used by sending trading partner/ or by receiving trading partner in order to be able to route messages the appropriated recipients: [0170]; [0179]; [0270]-[0273]; [0081])

However, Stewar does not explicitly disclose the identifiable operation altering the content of the message to ensure that the message has the proper format for the recipient service

In analogous art, Ghoneimy discloses the workflow engine including adapters acts as a converter supports communications between different type of devices: ([0039]; [0010])

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ghoneimy's ideas of using adapters acts as a converters supports

communications between different type of devices with Stewar's system in order to provide the flexibilities for integration communications system e.g. real-time data format converting supports for quick deployment workflow processes, see (Ghoneimy: abstract)

However, Stewar-Ghoneimy does not clearly teach logical routing of message

In analogous art, Davis discloses an EMS (element management system) for managing communications between numbers of diverse network elements. In Davis' EMS, logical transmission paths are applied to manage the communications, see (column 5, lines 40-67; column 6, lines 1-14)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Davis's ideas of applying logical transmission paths into" Stewar-Ghoneimy's system in order to employ well-known standard in to communication management network to save resources and development time and further to increase flexibilities fro communication network i.e. supporting large scale communication network comprising different network element types having a variety of protocols, see (Davis: column 5, lines 11-16)

Regarding claim 32:

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis further discloses an open platform overlaying a public network: (Stewar discloses an open, and scalable software platform for dynamic business-to-business collaboration such as enterprise collaboration server: [0024])

Regarding claim 63:

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Stewar-Ghoneimy- Davis further discloses receiving registration request: (Stewar discloses the collaboration system receiving a registered set of business trading partners: [0027]; [0147])

A directory service: (Ghoneimy discloses Directory Services: [0007]; [0031]-[0032])

Regarding claims 51- 52:

Those claims are rejected for the same rational as rejections for claim 63

Regarding claim 64:

In addition to rejection in claims 1 and 32, Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis further discloses an interface that enables a plurality of services to post messages to and receive messages from said message routing network: (steward discloses the message routing mechanism for a collaboration system, comprising a collaboration hub hosting a collaboration space capable of receiving and sending messages between participants: abstract; [0081])

At least a portion of said plurality of services providing a menu of data operations that can he selectively applied to a message traversing said message routing network: (steward discloses "templates" which shares functionality with menu of data operations thereby participants can used to define sending messages: [0023]; [0165]; [0262]; [0263])

Regarding to claims 31, 50, 60-62, 70, 74 and 76-77:

Those claims are rejected for the same reasons as rejection claim 1

Regarding claims 3 and 5:

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Stewar-Ghoneimy-Davis further discloses Exentisble Markup language: (Stewar: [0063])

Regarding claim 4:

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Stewar-Ghoneimy-Davis further discloses one or more documents in said body element and said one or more documents in said attachment can accommodate any type of data: (Ghoneimy: Fig 14, attachment of many different files)

Regarding claim 6:

In addition to rejection in claim 4, Stewar-Ghoneimy- Davis further discloses text data (Ghoneimy: Fig 14, attachment of many different files)

Regarding claim 7:

In addition to rejection in claim 4, Stewar-Ghoneimy- Davis further discloses binary data (Fig 14, attachment of many different files)

Regarding claims 8, 27, 33-38, 40 and 78-79:

Those claims are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 1 and 32

Regarding claim 10:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which includes receiving includes receiving said message from a party that sends said message on behalf of a sender (Ghoneimy discloses the messages are sent to the work flow system first prior to sending by the work flow system to the receiver, see [0035]; [0072])

Regarding claims 17 and 39:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claims 1 and 34, which includes recursive ([0085]; [0093])

Regarding claims 18 and 30, 41-42:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claims 1 and 43, which includes wherein said determining occurs prior to physical delivery of said message (Ghoneimy: [0085]; [0093], wherein the routing scripts are executed prior to delivery of actual message to the destination)

Regarding claim 19:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which includes determining occurs dynamically during logical and physical delivery of said message (Ghoneimy: [0085])

Regarding claim 20:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which includes a routing script defines a procedure that determines an existence of one or more attributes of the message (Ghoneimy: [0088; [0090])

Regarding claims 21 and 43-44:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claims 1 and 34, which includes the message routing method of claim 1, wherein a routing script defines a procedure based on pattern matching (Ghoneimy: [0090])

Regarding claims 22 and 45-46:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claims 1 and 34, which includes wherein a routing script defines a procedure that compares one or more attributes of a message to a reference value (Ghoneimy: [0090]-[0093])

Regarding to claims 23-25 and 47:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claims 1 and 45, which includes a routing rule, said routing rule including a condition and one or more actions (Ghoneimy: abstract; [0006]; [0089]-[0093])

Regarding claims 26 and 48:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claims 25 and 47, which includes conditions are combined using one or more of an AND, OR, XOR, and NOT operators (Ghoneimy: [0091])

Regarding claim 28:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claim 1, which includes delivering includes delivering said message upon a polling action by said in-transit service: (Stewar discloses "Publish-side filters / Receiver-side filters" those shares functionality with "in-transit services" as claimed used by sending trading partner/ or by receiving trading partner in order to be able to route messages the appropriated recipients: [0170]; [0179]; [0270]-[0273]; [0081])

Regarding claims 29 and 56:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claims 1 and 52, which includes delivering includes delivering said message to said in-transit service for one of a data transformation operation, an enrichment operation, a cross-reference id mapping operation, a filtering operation, and a credit scoring operation (Ghoneimy: [0039]; [0101])

Regarding claim 49:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claim 32, which includes said message routing network provides a transport level messaging service (Ghoneimy: [0035])

Regarding claims 53 and 67:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claims 52 and 64, which includes service provides a data transformation service: (Ghoneimy discloses the workflow

engine including adapters acts as a converter supports communications between different type of devices: [0039]; [0010]; [0101])

Regarding claims 54 and 68:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claims 52 and 64, which includes service provides a data enrichment service (Ghoneimy: [0101])

Regarding claims 55 and 69:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claims 52 and 64, which includes service provides a cross-reference service (Ghoneimy: [0049]; [0204])

Regarding claim 66:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claim 65, which includes said message routing network is implemented on a public network (Ghoneimy: [0030]; [0059])

Regarding claims 9 and 75:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claims 1 and 64, which includes the simple object access protocol (SOAP): (Stewar: [0338])

Regarding claim 65:

Stewar – Ghoneimy- Davis discloses a method as discuss in claim 64, which includes a transport level messaging service: (Ghoneimy: [0090])

Claims 57 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Stewart-Ghoneimy- Davis in view of Heuring (U.S. 6,965,878)

Regarding to claims 57 and 71:

Stewart-Ghoneimy- Davis discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claims 52 and 64, but does not explicitly teach a credit scoring service

In analogous art, Heuring discloses credit scoring system for business-to-business transaction: (abstract)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Heuring's ideas of credit scoring with Stewart-Ghoneimy-Davis's system in order to provide an efficient business communication network, see (Heuring: column 1, lines 10-15)

Claims 58-59 and 72-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Stewart-Ghoneimy- Davis in view of Owens et al. (U.S. 6,633,630)

Regarding claims 58-59 and 72-73:

Stewart-Ghoneimy- Davis discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claims 52 and 64, but does not explicitly teach a service is selected from said directory of services by a recipient service

In analogous art, Owens discloses messages are sent and received accordance with preferences of sender and recipients: (abstract)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Owens's ideas of sending and receiving a messages accordance with preferences of sender and recipients with Stewart-Ghoneimy- Davis's system in order to provide flexibilities and convenient for communication system users, see (Owens: column 2, lines 9-19)

The prior arts made of records and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "System and method for routing messages between applications": 20020019797; 20020128946; 200300118808

Conclusions

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lan-Dai Thi Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-7959. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday from 8:30am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob A. Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

08/16/2007

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
8/19/7